

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated February 7, 2007. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The disclosure stands objected to for various informalities which the Examiner has pointed out. These have been corrected in the "Cross-Reference to Related Applications" section. The Claims were objected as to the order of the claims. These have not been changed.

Claims 1-36 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,369. A Terminal Disclaimer has been provided. As such, Applicant believes that this rejection has been overcome, withdrawal of which is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Wilz Sr. et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,152,369. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's present invention, as defined by the amended claims, is directed toward a system that is operable to access information about software running on a PC in response to the scanning of a machine resolvable code (MRC). Once the software identification code associated with this software is accessed, then this software identification code can be transmitted to an intermediate site. At the intermediate site, there is provided an associative database that contains associations between different software identification codes and one or more of the remote locations on the network. The matching remote location information, in the form of a routing URL, is then transferred back to the first computer or user's PC to allow the computer then to access a particular site. Therefore, the routing to a particular site is initiated by the operation of scanning a particular MRC but the actual direction is provided by the software code. Therefore, it is not necessary for the information in the MRC to be utilized for the navigation operation but, rather, the navigation is conditioned upon what the software code comprises. This software identification code is also a code that is an integral part of the software and is accessible after the software is installed on the user's PC.

The Examiner has rejected the claims primarily in view of the portion of the specification of *Wilz* found at column 27, line 63-column 28, line 15. This portion of the specification of *Wilz* is set forth as follows:

In order that each subsystem 52, 53 and 54 can connect with RTD Server 51 and access the RTD information record associated with any package logged-in with the system, the following measures are taken: (1) each logged-in package 56 is labelled with a URL-encoded bar code symbol 57 having an information field structure shown in FIG. 12, as well as a conventional name/address label; and (2) the URL encoded within the bar code symbol is used to specify the location of an information storage field 58 represented on a statically-defined HTML-encoded information field 59 on a web-page stored on the RTD Information Server 51 and served to client subsystems by HTTP Server 60. The size of each Web-based information storage field 58 is sufficient to store ASCII information describing the unique product identification number assigned to the corresponding product being routed and tracked within the system. The RTD information record in the RDBMS 55 associated with any particular package is linked to the URL by the product identification number stored at the information field specified by the URL.

In the first paragraph set forth in paragraph 6.1 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes with respect to the portion of *Wilz* set forth above that there is included in the “first computer running a software application” a “software identification code unrelated to the machine resolvable code.” In the portion of the specification set forth, it refers to Fig. 11. Fig. 11 sets forth the server and the software and the only discussion is of the RDBMS (55) that operates at the server. This is the database structure. There is no discussion of a software identification code that is unrelated to the machine resolvable code that has an association with at least one or more remote locations. Thus, Applicant does not see how the Examiner is applying this portion of the specification to the claims at issue.

In the second paragraph of paragraph 6.1 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that, in response to sensing by the input device, the at least one software identification code is transferred to the computer. Applicant believes that all that is discussed in this portion of the

specification is the transfer of a URL to a particular location to provide a look-up operation in the database in the first field. The URL that is transferred is a URL (5a). Thus, Applicant does not see how this portion of the specification discloses the use of the “software identification” that is distinct from the machine resolvable code and unrelated thereto.

In the third paragraph of paragraph 6.1 in the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that there is some association of the software identification codes and ones of the one or more remote locations stored in the database. The database only stores an association between a URL and information about the package. This is basically what a bar code is typically used for, i.e., a database pointer. Thus, Applicant does not believe that this portion of the specification sets forth any association between a software identification and a remote location. The only code that is discussed is the URL that is on the package.

In the fourth paragraph of paragraph 6.1 of the Office Action, on page 6 thereof, the Examiner indicates that the *Wilz* reference in the above noted portion of the specification discloses that a look-up operation is performed at the second computer to match the software identification code with the associated at least one or more of the remote locations. Again, all that is provided is a URL that is similar to a bar code which is nothing more than a database pointer. This allows the association between the URL and the database field illustrated in Fig. 11b to be accessed. Further, the second paragraph on page 6 of the Office Action sets forth the examiners position that the remote routing information is returned to the first computer that corresponds to the software identification code. Applicant believes this is incorrect and the Applicant also believes there is no step of accessing with the first computer the one or more remote locations in accordance with the returned remote routing information.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the present inventive concept, as defined by the currently presented claims does not anticipate or obviate Applicant’s present inventive concept. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection with respect to Claim 1. The remaining claims are related to Claim 1 and, for the same reasons, Applicant believes that *Wilz* does not anticipate or obviate such. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection with respect to Claims 1-36.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-26,664 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

/Gregory M. Howison, Reg. # 30,646/
Gregory M. Howison
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/ljo/dd

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
August 7, 2007